



2009 Decisions

Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

7-27-2009

USA v. John McLean

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2009

Recommended Citation

"USA v. John McLean" (2009). *2009 Decisions*. 939.
https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2009/939

This decision is brought to you for free and open access by the Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2009 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository.

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 08-2507

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Appellant

v.

JOHN MCLEAN

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Pennsylvania
(D.C. Criminal No. 04-cr-00408-001)
District Judge: Honorable Edwin M. Kosik

Submitted Under Third Circuit LAR 34.1(a)
July 13, 2009

Before: RENDELL, FUENTES and ROTH, Circuit Judges.

(Filed: July 27, 2009)

OPINION OF THE COURT

RENDELL, *Circuit Judge*.

This appeal raises a single issue: whether a district court may reduce a defendant's sentence under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2), the statutory provision allowing a court to reduce a sentence which is "based on a sentencing range that has subsequently been lowered by

the Sentencing Commission,” when that sentence is imposed pursuant to a binding plea agreement. Concluding that enforcement of the stipulated sentence was not required, the District Court reduced defendant John McLean’s sentence; the government appealed.¹ We conclusively resolved the issue in *United States v. Sanchez*, holding, “If ‘binding’ is to have meaning, it cannot be undone by the discretionary possibility of a different sentence under § 3582(c).” 562 F.3d 275, 282 (3d Cir. 2009).

Here, McLean stipulated to the sentence imposed in a binding plea agreement under Fed. R. Crim. P. 11(c)(1)(c), the validity of which is undisputed. Accordingly, we will REVERSE the order of the District Court and REMAND the case.

¹ The District Court had jurisdiction under 18 U.S.C. § 3231. We exercise jurisdiction pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1291.